

communication. Does that tie in with brain communication? We need information with regard to Alzheimer's disease or whatever. Also, behavior and performance research, long-term effects of microgravity on muscle coordination, mental acuity, and once again, the protein crystal growth experiments.

These are just a few of the things that are going on in the space program these days. I just mention these things now and, in subsequent remarks here on the floor, I want to give more information on some of these. I wanted to set the stage this morning by going back in just a few of the things that I have mentioned with regard to the value of basic research in this country, and that NASA is out there, right now, doing that kind of cutting edge, basic research, in this new laboratory of space.

Every year, NASA publishes a book called "Spinoffs." This one is "Spinoff, 1994," a whole book full of some of the things that NASA has been doing that are of value right here on Earth. Health and medicine, environment and resources management, public safety, consumer, home, recreational spinoffs, transportation, computer technology, industrial productivity, and manufacturing technology.

I will not try to read all the things here this morning for people, but I commend them to my colleagues and the staffs here on the floor for reading, to see what is going on in some of these areas. We will be talking more about some of these things as time goes on.

I know the time is limited here this morning. I will make some more lengthy remarks in days ahead. I wanted to take this time this morning to set the stage for the upcoming debate on NASA's budget.

People have looked up for hundreds of thousands of years and wondered what is up there in the air, and then the Wright brothers went ahead and learned how to fly and learned how to stay up there for a period of time, and people first thought, what use was it. But we know what use it became later on—our whole aircraft and airline industry that lets people travel to far places around the world.

Every time we come up with a new capability for doing research, it seems that there are those who do not want to recognize that something good may come out of it, whether it be agriculture research, metals research, aeronautical research, oceanography, geographical research, or whatever.

But, as I said starting out, if there is one thing this Nation has learned, it is that money and time spent on basic, fundamental research in whatever area usually comes back and shows more value than we could ever foresee at the outset.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO C. ABBOTT SAFFOLD, SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in hailing the faithful service of Abby Saffold, who has served as secretary to the Democratic caucus since 1987. Abby has been one of the greatest fixtures in this body, and I cannot imagine the remarkably different place this Chamber would have been without her.

I remember well the days when this body was not so divided by party lines. Abby is a rare example of a person who provided her expertise to all, regardless of party. She did not concern herself with which side of the aisle we were on. She was helpful to anyone who needed of her.

I am sure Abby could tell remarkable stories about the questions that were posed to her throughout her career in the Senate. If someone was planning a vacation for 1999, they would first call Abby to ask if the Senate would be in session—and she would know. I am sure that she has been asked countless times "When will be be out of here tonight?" "What's on the lunch menu today?" or "What's the best joke you can tell me, Abby?"

Abby has served as a school teacher and a case workers, and I am sure that those experiences have led to her expertise in working for and with Members of the Senate. She is well known for her endless knowledge of legislative procedures and negotiating skills, and for avoiding disaster through her expertise.

Abby was here with us all the late nights, still sharp, awake, and aware. There was no question whether she would be on the floor the next morning, and she was just as cheerful.

Abby is undoubtedly one of the brightest luminaries we have had the opportunity to work with here in the Senate. She learned from her experiences in Senator BYRD's office, working her way up from legislative correspondent to her position as the secretary of the majority, and most recently, as the secretary to the minority.

Senator BYRD taught her well. He passed on his attention for detail and professionalism to a truly great staffer. In appointing her, Senator BYRD gave us one of the greatest gifts any colleague could have—the opportunity for us to know the endless kindness of Abby Saffold. As Senator BYRD recently said, "Abby has done it all, and done it all very, very well."

As I look toward my own retirement, I would like to express by best wishes to Abby for hers. I doubt I will ever meet any finer person. We will all miss her presence here in this Chamber.

TRIBUTE TO DUANE GARRETT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, only 48 years old, a veritable dynamo, exuding ideas and proposals, knowing his words commanded attention from the humblest abode to the White House

itself, Duane Garrett seemed to have it all.

With a loving family, legions of friends, the respect and admiration of the lowly and highly placed alike, Duane appeared boundlessly blessed.

Lawyer, businessman, political adviser, art and stamp collector, sport savant, historian for the San Francisco Giants, fishing boat skipper—no one could fillet a salmon with such aplomb—radio talk show host, television commentator, Duane was a talented universalist—the proverbial Renaissance man.

Serious and thoughtful in his political analysis, witty and full of fun in conversation, a tenacious fighter for what he believed, yet practical and down-to-earth in his judgments, Duane was a true prodigy.

A giving man, always surprising friends with a gift—a stamp to a collector, a baseball card from a hero of long-ago to a young fan—but as only the generous can, Duane brushed aside gratitude. "It was nothing. Just thinking about you," he would say.

And he would mean it because he gave from his heart.

With him, everything was done with enthusiasm born of interest in people and intensified by an endless curiosity about our world and our place in history.

He took to the microphone of his talk show with the same unrestrained gusto as he would enter a private conversation with an old friend.

He never held back. He always gave his all. He drew unselfishly from his knowledge and experience. Widely read and deeply thoughtful, he cut quickly and expertly to the heart of issues.

Certainly, I benefited from this ability as he advised me over the years, most recently as the cochair of my campaign for the U.S. Senate.

His candor could be counted upon. His word was his absolute bond. His thought was as rich and inventive as any person I know.

Also, he was a good friend, a person of great warmth and compassion. His mere walking into a room brought a brightness and warmth.

His bearish looming over a podium at a political dinner—and he was master of ceremonies at countless of them for me—was sure to give instant vibrancy to festivities. He was a master not only of long range ideas and concerns, but of the moment.

Actually, when his many talents and attributes are added together, the sum seems larger than life.

That makes his loss all the greater.

A giant who suddenly, without hint or warning, silences himself inevitably conjures a mystery.

But even in death there can be no detractor from what he contributed to life, no diminution of his love for Patty and his daughters, Laura and Jessica; no devaluation in the worth of the counsel and friendship he gave, or of the affection and respect he received in return.

While we may never learn or understand why this ebullient man should end his life, we can never subtract from his accomplishments.

We may never fathom the why of death, but we shall always be thankful for the fullness of his life.

Outwardly, Duane was the epitome of confidence and elan, seemingly so impregnable. Whatever pain he felt, or doubts he had, remained concealed behind the customary lift of his head and broad smile.

What drove him to that final, solitary walk on the Golden Gate Bridge may elude us, but what we shall always know is his love for his family and his zest whenever he was on the other end of the phone, or sitting in the living room or booming his opinion on radio or television.

His life is what matters. His death is mere punctuation that makes clear the substance and meaning that came before.

Indeed, Duane seemed to have it all, and for those of us who knew him he endlessly seemed to give his all.

So very much alive, so bursting with ideas, so expressive, so reaching out to help others, Duane, even now that he is gone, reverberates in our mind in endless reminders of the vigor and principle he brought to politics and other endeavors.

Campaign manager, advisor, counselor, invariably shrewd and insightful, always helpful, thoroughly unselfish, unfailingly available and generous with his time, Duane Garrett was always there.

And always shall he be.

FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to the Foreign Relations Revitalization Act of 1995 to assist the President in his efforts to deal with the growing threat to American interests from Iran. President Clinton clearly sought to address this threat with his May 6 Executive order establishing a full United States embargo of Iran. It is my hope that short of successfully encouraging other nations from trading with Iran, an extremely challenging task, the President will be able to use the authority in this amendment to encourage other countries to at least refrain from contributing to Iranian weapons capabilities.

The 1992 Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act, which I cosponsored with then-Senator GORE, established sanctions against third parties which assist Iran and Iraq in their efforts to rebuild their weapons capabilities. It was a start, but it did not go far enough. Efforts by Senator LIEBERMAN and me last year to expand the legislation were unsuccessful.

The 1992 bill was intended to target not only the acquisition of conventional weapons, but weapons of mass destruction as well. In the process of

amending the bill to the 1993 Defense Act, however, the explicit references to weapons of mass destruction were dropped.

The amendment I am offering today attempts to make these applications absolutely clear. It also removes from the proposed sanctions exceptions for assistance under the Freedom Support Act, thereby removing the benefit of the doubt Congress gave Russia in 1992. As I will explain later in my statement, Russia has used this exception to the detriment of United States policy in the Persian Gulf.

To the current list of sanctions against persons assisting Iran and Iraq in its weapons programs, which already include procurement and export sanctions, the amendments we are offering today add the denial of visas, denial of commercial credit, and denial of authority to ship products across United States territory. To the list of sanctions against countries offering similar assistance, the amendment adds the denial of licenses for export of nuclear material, denial of foreign military sales, denial of the transfer of controlled technology, denial of the transfer of computer technology, suspension of the authority of foreign air carriers to fly to or from the United States, and a prohibition on vessels that enter the ports of sanctioned countries.

The threat from Iraq is not an immediate concern. The most important aspect of our policy with regard to Iraq must be to remain firm on the U.N. embargo. But given the history of the Iraqi military buildup before the Gulf war, the sanctions included in the Iran-Iraq Act may at a later date be as important with regard to Iraq as they are currently in the case of Iran. Once the embargo is lifted, there will be a great temptation for cash-strapped economies to resume sales of military hardware to Iraq. Outside forces may once again be compelled to maintain a balance in the region through arms sales and a dangerous escalation of firepower.

It is also vitally important to prevent the reemergence of an Iraqi conventional military threat. One need only observe the origins of the weapons which constituted the Iraqi threat in 1990 to know that the key to any post-embargo containment strategy will depend on our ability to influence Iraq's trading partners in Europe, Russia, the People's Republic of China, and North Korea.

The threat from Iran is more immediate. The Iranian buildup in the Persian Gulf is common knowledge. Its importation of hundreds of North Korean Scud-C missiles, its intention to acquire the Nodong North Korean missiles currently under development, and its efforts to develop nuclear weapons are well established—as is its conventional weapons buildup.

Successive CIA directors, and Secretaries Perry and Christopher have all testified to the effect that Iran is engaged in an extensive effort to acquire

nuclear weapons. In February, Russia signed an agreement to provide Iran with a 1,000 megawatt light water nuclear reactor. The Russians indicate that they may soon agree to build as many as three more reactors—another 1,000 megawatt reactor, and two 440 megawatt reactors.

I have raised my concerns regarding this sale with the administration on a number of occasions. I have maintained that under the Freedom Support Act of 1992, which the Iran Iraq Act of 1992 was intended to reinforce, the President must either terminate assistance to Russia or formally waive the requirement to invoke sanctions out of concern for the national interest.

The State Department has informed me that “to the best of its knowledge, Russia has not actually transferred relevant material, equipment, or technology to Iran,” and so there is no need to consider sanctions. I have been further informed that they are “examining the scope of the proposed Russian nuclear cooperation with Iran, and as appropriate, they will thoroughly evaluate the applicability of sanctions,” presumably, if at a later date they can confirm the transfer.

I have no reason to question the State Department's evaluation of the facts on the ground. However, I would note that there have been public reports of as many as 220 Russians employed at the site of the proposed reactor. There seems to be a dangerously obscure standard for determining when material, equipment, or technology useful in the manufacture of nuclear weapons has actually been transferred, especially when as is the case with Iran, the reactor may already be partially complete.

At what point in the construction of the reactors does the transfer become significant? Do we allow the Russians to build portions of the reactor which do not strictly involve the transfer of dangerous equipment or technology while Iran obtains the most vital assistance from other sources? Although I cannot make this determination myself, common sense and an appropriate sense of caution would dictate that any assistance provided Iran in its efforts to acquire nuclear technology is significant.

The administration declined to identify the dispatch of technicians to the site as sufficient proof that a technology transfer was occurring. However, now that we are approaching the completion of site inspection and preparation, and nearing the start of the actual construction, it is my hope that the President will make another assessment of the situation.

I would point out that although the administration may have technical grounds for arguing that it is not yet required to invoke sanctions, making a determination on the applicability of sanctions sooner rather than later would serve as necessary leverage in resolving the issue. My intention is not to gut U.S. assistance to Russia. It is